

I. F. Stone's Weekly

COPYRIGHT 1953 BY I. F. STONE'S WEEKLY, INC.

VOL. I NUMBER 6

FEBRUARY 21, 1953



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

Anti-Zionism or Anti-Semitism?

THE RUSSIANS FEAR WAR AND ARE SHUTTING the last windows on the West in preparation for it. That seems the most reasonable explanation for the anti-Zionist "show trials" which have begun in the Soviet world. The Jews are the last people in the U.S.S.R. and its satellites who still had some contact with the West through such Jewish philanthropic organizations as the Joint Distribution Committee.

Soviet policy never went beyond cultural autonomy; centripetal nationalist tendencies are as much feared as in the days of the Czars. Nationalism (except at times for Russians) is officially stigmatized as "bourgeois," though the constant attacks on "Titoism" in the satellites show how strongly it survives under communism. The Zionists, like the "bourgeois" nationalists among the Ukrainian, White Russian and other Soviet minorities, have been the frequent object of purge, arrest and imprisonment since the early years of the Revolution.

After the war, privately at Yalta, publicly later, Stalin took a more friendly attitude toward Jewish national aspiration and changed the anti-Zionist line traditional with the Marxist movement to vote for the partition of Palestine and the establishment of the Jewish State. Thanks to that change, Israel was able to circumvent the arms embargo imposed by the State Department and to buy arms and receive planes through Czechoslovakia—the ex post facto "crime" of the Slansky trial.

THE RELATIONS OF STATES ARE NOT DETERMINED BY SENTIMENT. Israel found favor in Moscow's eyes when it fought the British. It lost favor afterwards because of its Western orientation and its increasing reliance on American capital. Zionist longings are far from dead among the Jews of Russia, as the writer can attest from talks and observations on his own underground trip from Poland to Palestine in the spring of 1946. The recrudescence of anti-Semitism in Russia amid the miseries of World War II and its deliberate propagation by the Germans in the occupied areas of White Russia and the Ukraine provoked from not a few assimilated Russian Jews the same reaction of national pride that it once did in Pinsker and Herzl. The fact that Israel has become an American dependent must make Zionism seem more than ever dangerous to the rulers of the Kremlin.

The story is as old as the Bible, where we read that the Egyptians enslaved the Jews lest they aid an enemy in time of war. The same fate shadows all minorities, as our own Japanese Americans can testify, and its constant repetition must strengthen the case for Jewish nationhood. But the Bible repeats another lesson, equally terrible, and that is to keep out of the quarrels of Egypt and Nineveh. Israel lies now as then

at the crossroads of the world, where it can all too easily be trampled by contending armies. It needs peace. It cannot afford to fight the battles of the great Powers. For no nation would a new war be a greater tragedy than for tiny Israel on the edge of the petroleum fields which will be the first target of the air fleets. And no people needs peace more than the Jews, a minority everywhere. In a long conflict, the Jews on the Soviet side will be suspected of pro-Westernism and on the anti-Soviet side of pro-Communism.

NONE OF US KNOW WHAT IS REALLY HAPPENING IN EASTERN EUROPE. The vulnerable point of the Soviet regime in "psychological warfare" is its extreme suspicion. No one yet knows, perhaps no one will ever know, whether the Red generals executed before the war were guilty of treason or only the victims of German ingenuity in spreading suspicion. No one knows what planted whispers may have played a part in provoking these new trials. The Russian rulers have a way of erecting possibilities into actualities and then staging trials to "prove" what they fear. Their trials are political morality plays which cynically assume an audience too unintelligent to be impressed by anything less than melodrama. It is not enough to prove a man mistaken; he must be displayed as a monster. Ever since the 20's, the Soviet public has been fed on a heavy diet of conspiracy, treason, poisoning and murder in this political dramaturgy. This is the perspective in which one cannot help but see the Slansky trial and the fantastic charges against the nine Moscow doctors, six of them Jewish. Their purpose is to warn the Jews of the Soviet world to break all ties with the West and to stifle all nationalist feeling "or else." The repercussions may be less than anti-Semitic but are more than anti-Zionist. They must pander to the covert anti-Semitism which lingered on underground after the revolution.

THE SITUATION IS BAD, BUT MUCH TOO SERIOUS to be used as a kind of political sideshow for UJA fund-raising and the cold war. There are 3,000,000 Jews in Russia, the second largest Jewish community in the world. The Jews of America are very foolish and short-sighted if they jump on this affair gleefully to show that those lie who link Jew with Communist. Israel will be very irresponsible if it allows the fate of Russian Jewry to get involved at the UN in another endless cold war propaganda debate, where it will be exploited by many people who care very little for Jews in Russia or anywhere else. Wild talk about extermination, equating Hitler and Stalin, can only hurt Soviet Jewry. This is the time for Israel to demonstrate the most responsible kind of statesmanship, and to remember that Zion's historic mission is peace.

The Campus Witch-Hunt: The Attack on The Open Mind

Washington, D. C.

A QUESTION WHICH DESERVES IMMORTALITY was put by Senator Herman Welker, Republican, of Idaho. The scene was a room in the Senate Office Building. The occasion was the first of the college hearings by the Jenner subcommittee of the Senate Internal Security Committee. The witness, Oscar H. Shaftel, an assistant professor of English in New York's Queens College, was being obdurate about the \$64 question. "Do you think," Welker finally asked, in a stern voice, "that any member of this committee would hesitate to answer that question?" The witness was at a loss for an answer. He had been pinned to the mat at last.

Many were the feats of casuistry performed by the committee members that day as they wrestled with the problem of subversion in education. Shaftel, citing chapter and verse with the agility of a hardened heretic, had insisted that the Fifth amendment was intended to protect the innocent. Senator Willis Smith, of North Carolina, smote him hip and thigh. "Now you say," Smith began softly, "that this was intended to protect innocence. But if you were not a member of the Communist party, you wouldn't have to invoke the Fifth amendment, would you?"

IN THAT LONG AND ARDUOUS FIRST SESSION, one type of question was conspicuous by its absence. Though the declared purpose was to uncover the indoctrination of students by Communist teachers, no question was asked on the subject. The omission seemed strange. A teacher who denied that he had injected subversive ideas into the minds of the youth in his care could be prosecuted for perjury if witnesses turned up to testify against him. A teacher who denied that Communists were instructed to indoctrinate their students would risk the same penalty if an ex-Communist teacher testified to the contrary. The mere refusal to answer questions about indoctrination would have been impressive.

The range of the questions the committee did ask was wide. A witness was asked whether he had contributed to the defense of Morris Schappes more than a decade ago when Schappes was prosecuted for perjury as a result of the Rapp-Coudert school inquiry in New York. There was a question about the execution of the Polish Socialists, Ehrlich and Alter, in Russia during the war. A witness was asked whether he belonged to a Committee to Win The War in 1943-44. But no witness was asked whether he had ever tried to lead a student down the primrose path of Marxist doctrine. Or whether as a member of a Communist teacher's cell he had been instructed to engage in ideological seduction.

THE COMMITTEE SEEMED UNWILLING to get to the supposed point of the inquiry. Perhaps experience had taught it to tread warily. Against none of the teachers discharged in New York have witnesses been produced to testify that there had been indoctrination. The same Senate subcommittee last Fall received

31 exhibits and heard 41 witnesses, including three Communists who had recanted and turned informer. Its report last January 2 on "Subversive Influence in the Educational Process" does indeed say, "Evidence was adduced that the Communists made an effort to use the classroom to carry on a program of indoctrination. Thus Dr. Bella Dodd testified. She had no doubt whatsoever that she had used her position as a teacher to influence her students."

But in its report the Senate subcommittee withheld what the overwrought but conscientious Dr. Bella Dodd actually said in her testimony on this point. The passage is extraordinary in its revelation and deserves quotation in full. Here it is as it appears on pages 18 and 19 of the printed record:

"Senator FERGUSON. When you were a teacher and really a Communist, what did you do to the students and other teachers?"

"Mrs. DODD. God help me for what I did. I was not a member of the Communist party, but there was no doubt in my mind—

"Senator FERGUSON. But you had a philosophy and you served the cause.

"Mrs. DODD. There is no doubt in my mind that I did a great deal of harm.

"Senator FERGUSON. And how did you function among the students?"

"Mrs. DODD. I was their faculty adviser on many problems. I worked with individual students. I was particularly keen about my students. I was very sympathetic, and I was very popular among my students.

"Senator FERGUSON. Do you think you may have convinced some of them to become Communists?"

"Mrs. DODD. I have no doubt that I did.

"Senator FERGUSON. Was that one of your purposes in life as a teacher?"

"Mrs. DODD. No. That is not true. My purpose at that time—I thought my purpose was to create an open mind, to create a clear-thinking people—people who would throw aside all preconceived prejudices, all preconceived thoughts. My thought was to teach people how to think.

"Well, I have discovered since then that the mind which is so open is often the mind which gets filled with the first evil wind that comes by; that what you have to do is to see the truth and the truth will help you to ward off those evil influences."

Thus the "indoctrination" to which Dr. Bella Dodd confessed with stricken conscience was not indoctrination in Marxism but in what we had been taught to believe was basic Americanism. She wanted her pupils to have an "open mind" and it is this which she now thinks wrong. Like so many ex-Communists she has swung from one authoritarianism to another. The Roman Catholic Church, to which she returned on leaving the party, has always believed that the open mind was a danger, that revealed truth and certified dogma were the only safeguards against error. The implications are those that the Very Rev.

Hunter Guthrie, S.J., president of Georgetown University, developed in his commencement address here in Washington in June, 1950, when he called academic freedom "the soft under-belly of our American way of life."

IF THE McCARRAN COMMITTEE WERE really interested in the "subversive" ideas which threaten American education, it would have explored Dr. Bella Dodd's remark. If the open mind is a danger, who is to close it? Against what ideas? Who is to determine which winds of doctrine are evil? She regrets her purpose was "to teach people how to think." Does she think it would be better to teach them blindly to believe?

To the authoritarian ideologies of the right, the educational witch-hunters turn a deaf ear. No subpoena has ever been issued for Allen Zoll, though his pro-Fascist activities before the war were notorious and his influence on American education is growing. When George A. Timone, of the New York Board of Education, was before the McCarran committee last Fall, no one asked him about the meeting he sponsored in 1939 at which Hitler, Mussolini and Father Coughlin were hailed as "enemies of communism." No one asked him why Gerald L. K. Smith wrote in his news letter of March 22, 1946, "Mayor O'Dwyer of New York is being congratulated by Christian Nationalists for naming a strong follower of Father Coughlin, Mr. Timone, to the Board of Education." Timone was received as an ally and friend by the McCarran committee. Neither McCarran's successor, Jenner, nor the Velde inquiry nor McCarthy is interested in this kind of "organized subversion," though already so effective in subverting free inquiry on the campus.

WHEN JAMES B. CONANT WAS BEFORE THE Senate Foreign Relations Committee on February 3, Senator Fulbright asked him whether "some good purpose can be served" by the Congressional investigations which are setting out on the supposed task "of determining whether or not there is communism in the schools." Conant's reply was "No. Frankly I do not."

To set up a bar against Communists in teaching, divorced from evidence of abuse in the classroom, is to venture on the endless task of determining who is really a Communist. This is to play into the hands of those who want thought control in America. It would make conformity necessary to avoid suspicion.

Few any longer have the temerity to say it, but defense of the right of Communists to teach is essential to academic freedom in America. This like all other liberties is indivisible. As Conant said to Senator Wiley at the same hearing "only the instigation of a police state within a university itself" would make it possible to determine who were the Communists. They could not be found "without destroying the life of the university." This is the life threatened by the campus witch-hunt.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

• Editor and Publisher, I. F. STONE

Published weekly except the last two weeks of August at Room 225, 1416 F St., N.W., Washington 4, D. C. Subscription rates: Domestic, \$5 a year; Canada, Mexico and elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere, \$6; England and Continental Europe, \$10 by 1st class mail, \$15 by air; for Israel, Asia, Australia and Africa, \$10 by first class mail, \$20 by air mail. Single copy, 15 cents. Contents covered by copyright. Telephone, STerling 3-0938. Application for entry as Second Class matter is pending.

Vol. 1, No. 6  February 21, 1953

COMMENT

The Pope Himself . . .

Washington, D. C.

THE TWO MESSAGES ON BEHALF OF THE Pope, one last December and the second last week-end, show how deeply opinion abroad has been stirred by the Rosenberg case. The President's denial of clemency is inhumane and politically stupid. Comparison with the sentences in the Fuchs and Allan Nunn May cases, where far more vital atomic information was involved, is enough to show how barbaric is the death sentence imposed on the Rosenbergs. When the Holy See itself feels impelled by "motives of charity" to transmit appeals through its Apostolic Delegate at Washington, one begins to get a faint idea of what a bad impression execution of the death sentence will create. Commutation of sentence would be a moral victory for the better America and there is still time for last-minute appeals to the White House.

Stevenson?

JUST IN CASE READERS INSIST ON knowing what we think of our late candidate's Jeffer-

son-Jackson Day speech: very witty, like a good after dinner speech; nice plug for civil liberty; but not yet adequate for leadership in these times when we are moving rapidly toward war. Formosa was not mentioned. Sparkman did better than that in the Senate. We wait hopefully for more.

From Brannan Plan to Benson Boner

THE TERRIBLE NEW DUST STORMS in the Middle West as we go to press only emphasize the storms of another and figurative but no less serious variety blowing up in the West and South for the new Administration. Agricultural employment is down three quarter of a million from last year. Prices received by farmers have been moving downward for two years and are now 18 percent below February, 1951, while prices paid by farmers are substantially unchanged. The Western livestock market is in a chaotic condition and cotton exports are down sharply. The situation is so bad that Taft and Thye, ordinarily no advocates of giving things away, especially to foreigners, have introduced a bill "For the relief of storm-stricken areas in the Netherlands, the British Isles and other areas of Western Europe." The bill would authorize the President to donate abroad any and all agricultural commodities "acquired through price support operations and determined to be in excess of domestic requirements." (If dairy prices keep falling, Thye is liable to turn Wallaceite and advocate giving milk to Hottentots.)

With beautiful Republican ineptness, the new Secretary of Agriculture chose this moment of farm history to make a speech before the Central Livestock Association in St. Paul saying brightly, "Farmers should not be placed in a position of working for government bounty rather than producing for a free market. . . . Furthermore, inefficiency should not be subsidized in agriculture." In the warm-up Benson—the old coin phraser—said, "I declare without fear of successful contradiction that our rural people are today the strongest bulwark we have against all that is aimed . . . at

the very destruction of our American way of life. . . . No other segment of our population knows so well that 'as ye sow, so shall ye reap.'"

None other also knows so well that it doesn't matter what you sow or reap if you can't get a fair price for it at the market.

Poor Solomon, Poor Sheba, Poor Socrates, Etc.

"WE ARE NOT AFRAID," Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks told the annual Lincoln Night dinner of the Republican Middlesex Club in Boston, "to trust free enterprise to be enterprising. Through the stardust and sweat of the American system have come the highest standard of living in history. King Solomon in all his glory never drove to work in an automobile or watched a baseball game on television. The Queen of Sheba in all her splendor never enjoyed the luxury of nylon stockings."

And Socrates in all his wisdom had to drink hemlock instead of going to a nice shiny electric chair. And Columbus for all his genius had to take a slow boat instead of buying a ticket on TWA. And Cleopatra for all her wiles never had a really good deodorant. Who knows how much faster, further and more fragrantly they might all have progressed had they, too, trusted private enterprise.

The Dunce's Cap

TO SIDNEY HOOK, PROFESSOR OF Philosophy at New York University, pre-war Marxist and postwar Milquetoast, for telling a panel on "Freedom in Education" at the New York Civil Liberties Forum on Lincoln's Birthday, "It is not true that a state of fear exists in our colleges and that college teachers are less courageous and outspoken than they have been in the past. . . ."

You and The Postoffice

The Weekly goes to the postoffice at 3 p.m. every Wednesday afternoon, and—touch wood—we haven't missed a deadline yet. Since the third issue, it has been getting service under second class permit pending, but service is spotty. In downtown New York, many subscribers have been getting their issue on Friday, but in Brooklyn some readers complain they haven't been getting theirs until Monday or Tuesday, though in far-off California one reader reports that he gets his on Monday. Some places, by mistake, the Weekly may still be getting third class service. Let me know—and let your local postmaster know—about delays. In the meantime don't forget you can get a free copy of my new book, *The Truman Era*, with every two subs; for \$1, with one sub; or for \$2 in advance of publication. It will be published in April at \$3.50. I just finished reading the galleys—and though I say so as shouldn't, it's a darn good book.

—I. F. Stone

A New and Safe Form of Popular Front

NEW YORK

ROGER BALDWIN IN THE THIRTIES was a Popular Fronter. The annual luncheon of the New York Civil Liberties Union over which he presided here on Lincoln's Birthday was a Popular Front of a new kind. On the dais, among the liberals, were Robert Morris, counsel of the McCarran committee; Godfrey P. Schmidt, a professor of law at Fordham, who represented Bella Dodd before that committee; a staff writer for the *New Leader* and a man named Victor Hartnett, who was introduced by Baldwin as co-author of *Red Channels*, "one of our favorite works." Of course, everyone understood that Baldwin was joking, and there was a little titter with the applause from the well-behaved audience. But one wondered what such characters—and Roy Cohn, McCarthy's chief counsel on his new investigating committee—were doing at a civil liberties meeting. This was indeed infiltration and subversion, the infiltration of libertarian ranks by the witch-hunters, the subversion of basic libertarian principles by the social amenities of a friendly gathering with their enemies.

One panel chairman summing up at the end of the afternoon spoke of the "wisdom of having on one platform men of divergent views." This was eye-wash. No one spoke from the ranks of the purged teachers, the UN employees, the civil servants, the blacklisted artists or the Smith Act victims. But a platform was accorded their persecutors. They were admitted into respectable liberal company. They were listened to respectfully, and argument was muted, lest it impinge on the untactful. From the prepared text of the one first rate speech at the conference, that of the Rev. Dr. John Paul Jones, there was omitted a mild reference to A Certain Senator, "Senator McCarthy, heading a committee to investigate 'Communist thinking' in the colleges of the land, does not increase our sense of security," as if not to offend such honored guests as McCarthy's counsel, Cohn. Only Osmond Fraenkel broke the conspiracy of politeness to mention Louis Budenz by name and to protest his smear of the late Louis S. Weiss and of Professor Walter S. Gellhorn as Communists.

THE DIRECTORS OF THE CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION have been sucking their thumbs for many months, unable to make up their minds about the Fifth amendment in the attack on academic freedom and the UN. At this annual meeting, the

old libertarian stalwarts like Fraenkel and Arthur Garfield Hays, who once spoke for the ACLU, now appeared merely as participants in a discussion under its auspices. Ernest Angell, who presided over the panel on "Congressional Investigations and Constitutional Protection of Citizens' Rights," explained that Fraenkel and Telford Taylor, though directors of the ACLU, were speaking for themselves alone. The organization is split between those who struggle with diminishing energy for a classic libertarian position and those looking for a bridge to respectability. The organization is deadlocked on urgent questions because part of its board, local and national, really agrees with the witch-hunters, and hankers for a safe and popular front with the Morrisses, the Cohns and the new crop of Liz Dillings who turn out Counter-Attack.

The net effect of the most important panel, that on Congressional investigations, was to give the witch hunters a new sounding board, not to rebut them. Cohn, Morris and Schmidt took the offensive with ability, while of the three liberals, only Fraenkel acquitted himself with precision, learning and distinction. All three liberals were on the defensive. None touched on the realities in these Congressional investigations—their origin and motivations, their excursions in perjury. No one mentioned Lattimore, Vincent, Service or their other victims.

THERE WERE INDICATIONS IN TAYLOR'S TALK of the line on which the ACLU may give up the battle. This is the line of "conspiracy." Free speech is protected by the Constitution unless what is said is part of a conspiracy. So runs this, the government's, argument in the Smith Act cases. But the concept of conspiracy when divorced from the context of crime and applied to speech becomes an easy means of nullifying the First Amendment. "The doctrine of conspiracy," Mr. Justice Douglas said in his dissent in the Dennis case, "has served divers and oppressive purposes and its broad reach can be made to do great evil. But never until today has anyone seriously thought that the ancient law of conspiracy could constitutionally be used to turn speech into seditious conduct." To cast loose from the traditional moorings of incitement, overt act and clear and present danger and to substitute "conspiracy" in this sense as a guide is to abandon the cause of civil liberty, and enlist in the service of repression.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

2-21-53

Room 225 Kellogg Bldg.

1416 F Street, N.W., Washington 4, D. C.

Please enter the following subscription. \$5 for 1 year is enclosed. (See page 3 for foreign rates)

Name

Street

City Zone

State

I. F. Stone's Weekly

225 Kellogg Bldg.

1416 F St., N.W., Washington 4, D. C.

Application for

Second Class Entry

Is Pending